

From boatanchors@theporch.com Sat Jan 28 22:39:24 1995
Date: Sat, 28 Jan 1995 20:23:35 -0600
Message-Id: <199501290217.SAA11874@netcom16.netcom.com>
From: dgf@netcom.com (David Feldman)
Subject: Diodes used in Drake W4 wattmeter

Killed the diodes in my old W4 (about 1300W did it). Don't have a manual. Have tried several other diode pairs but can't get decent calibration even after adjusting the 4 pots against a Bird 43. What kind of diodes are required? Does someone have a manual/schematic I could have a copy of? Much thanx!!!!!! 73 Dave WB0GAZ dgf@netcom.com

From boatanchors@theporch.com Sat Jan 28 19:40:55 1995
Date: Sat, 28 Jan 1995 17:21:32 -0600
Message-Id: <v01510102ab4fac7d5ffe@[198.65.148.105]>
From: sfarmer@tulsa.com (Steven L. Farmer)
Subject: Re: Grab your flame throwers!...REDUX

[snip...]

>I believe what I said was: mark a subscriber "postpone" should be the
>first resort. And that was my suggestion during discussion when the
>matter was being explored in the Council of Elves. Apparently Jack
>chose that from the several views offered.
>

Oh what a tangled web they weaved
When our parents named us Steve

Actually Steve, I think Mr. T was misreading **my** posting, but when it comes to being misrepresented, I'm perfectly willing to share :-)

[more snips...]

>Speaking of resources: in the very near future there will be a call
>for **subscription** "contributions" to defray the direct costs of
>BOATANCHORS. The form and amount of those "contributions" is
>under discussion. Any ideas on that topic?
>

Yes, it would have to be contributions, since commercial use would run afoul of the "acceptable use" policies followed by all of the internet backbone sites. You don't want to do that. Dues **might** work, but you would have to be careful not to make a profit. And speaking of that, don't forget the IRS. They'll probably be involved whether you make a profit or not, even if you stick strictly with contributions.

While we're mulling this over, it would help to know two things. How many subscribers are there? And what exactly are the expenses?

73,

Steve (the *real* one!)

WA5RPF

From boatanchors@theporch.com Sat Jan 28 18:43:00 1995

Date: Sat, 28 Jan 1995 16:13:10 -0600

Message-Id: <F1SG1142.F1SG1153@mail.admin.wisc.edu>

From: TOM.A.ADAMS@mail.admin.wisc.edu

Subject: Letters to CQ?

to: boatanchors@theporch.com

The idea of writing CQ to congratulate them for thier "blast from the past"/ 50th Anniversary issue's coverage of old technology is rather like congratulating an industrial polluter for keeping a small exhibit of a species that it's normal operations drove into extinction. Make no mistake about it; these guys DO see our rigs as quaint museum pieces which have no more right to be on tha air than does a Benwood rotary spark gap! In fact, they're using the same arguments (with a lot less justification) that were used to ban spark from the air; (A) our technology isn't "state of the art" and as "efficient" as the latest imported digitoys, and (B) us AM people are "wasting" "THIER" spectrum (Oh, yes! A chunk of spectrum that has held one of those dynosaur sized 5 KHz bandwidth AM signals is so damaged that it can't EVER be reused by a civilized SSB station ever again!).

I guess it's all part of the nostalgia craze, and the desire to escape back to a more rational, less pressurized time in our past, but we're in the middle of an "AM Renaissance" on the ham bands. We're resurrecting rigs and technologies that date back 50 years or more, simply because this is a level of technology that we can deal with without having a PhD in solid state electronics and a quarter megabuck's worth of test equipment at our disposal.

In the past, the thing that attracted new hams was the desire to tinker. Now, the big draw is the desire to operate. The mad forward race of technology has made it tougher on the tinkerers, and easier for the talkers, so we're outnumbered. If one takes CQ's logic one step farther, it's easy to see that AM isn't the only thing that's facing extinction in ham radio; WE are too.

In the aviation community, hundreds of folks put unbelievable amounts of money and hours of work into restoring and flying Tiger Moths, Piper J-3 Cubs, and practically any other type of old airplane you can think of. At the same time, technology has marched on as quickly as it has in electronics, and with it, regulation. More and more airspace is controlled, and more and more requirements are added every year to make aviation safer and more "efficient". Yet, I

don't see anybody out there suggesting that P-51 Mustangs or Fokker Triplanes belong only in museums or "Good Old Days" magazine articles, simply because they aren't "state of the art", or because 90 MPH J-3 Cubs are clogging up airport approaches that have to be used by 600 MPH Sabreliners! Instead, the classic flying machines are respected, and practically worshipped; if you doubt that, just check out the EAA "Fly In" at Oshkosh, Wisconsin every year. For the week or so it's in progress, little Wittman Field becomes the world's busiest airport (literally), and ground traffic becomes a hopeless mess of the worshipful throngs.

The aviation folks discovered long ago that no matter HOW complex and oppressive the constraints of technology and regulation become, there's always enough free sky for EVERYONE to fly in. Just like there's enough amateur spectrum for EVERYONE to operate on, despite the whining of P.O.ed SSB types screaming for AM operators to be drawn and quartered!

Well, now that I've tried to be objective about this whole thing, I'm gonna let a lower, less worthy sentiment hang out.

I say we storm the CQ editorial offices, and stone the editor with burned out modulation transformers!!!

Mr. T, K9TA

From boatanchors@theporch.com Sat Jan 28 17:36:46 1995
Date: Sat, 28 Jan 1995 15:16:27 -0600
Message-Id: <Pine.SUN.3.91.950128161119.28648B-100000@access3.digex.net>
From: Tony Stalls <rstalls@access.digex.net>
Subject: Sabbatical

I will be taking a sabbatical from the BA list for a while. I'll still get the baratings mail however.

73,

Tony Stalls, K4KY0 (VA)
rstalls@access.digex.net

From boatanchors@theporch.com Sat Jan 28 12:48:54 1995
Date: Sat, 28 Jan 1995 10:35:15 -0600
Message-Id: <Pine.SUN.3.91.950128113008.15138B-100000@access1.digex.net>
From: Tony Stalls <rstalls@access.digex.net>
Subject: Re: Summary: Military Tube Testers

On Sat, 28 Jan 1995, Andy Wallace wrote:

> :-) Glad I could help out. Hey, if they have the adapters, please pass
> back the part # and price!

I called Fair Radio today (1/28/95) and they no longer have the MX949/U
adapter for the I-177 tube tester. Also they only have plain TV-7 tube
testers (no A, B, or D models) and NO TV-2's in stock.

^^

At least now we know...

73,

Tony
K4KY0

From boatanchors@theporch.com Sat Jan 28 18:49:53 1995
Date: Sat, 28 Jan 1995 16:32:08 -0600
Message-Id: <MAILQUEUE-101.950128163031.288@vilas.uwex.edu>
From: "Terry O'Laughlin" <OLAUGHLIN@vilas.uwex.edu>
Subject: T-195"B"

I have the same 400Hz synchro problems as Tom. However, when I
ordered a spare PA chassis from Fair Radio, it came from a T-195B and
has a small inverter circuit mounted on the side. Unfortunately Fair
Radio has no T-195B schematics.

I'd like to integrate the T-195B PA module and inverter into my T-195
by using the existing connectors and wiring harness. Does anyone have
a T-195B manual? I only need the schematics for the PA section and
the main wiring harness.